

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claims 25, 33, 35 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Roberts et al. (U.S. 2001/0026011). Claims 26, 28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al. in view of Oota (U.S. 6,018,167). Claims 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 36 and 38 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Drawings

It is noted that the Examiner has accepted the drawings as originally filed with this application.

Claim Amendments

By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claims 25, 26, 28, 30, 33, 35, and 37 and has amended claims 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 36 and 38 of this application. It is believed that the amended claims specifically set forth each element of Applicant's invention in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 36, and 38 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. Applicant's amended claim 27 comprises a combination of original claims 25, 26 and 27, thus redrafting claim 27 in independent form. Applicant's amended claim 29 comprises a combination of original claims 25, 28 and 29, thus redrafting claim 29 in independent form. Applicant's amended claims 31 comprises a combination of original claims 25, 30 and 31, thus redrafting claim 31 in independent form. Applicant's amended claims 32 comprises a combination of original claims 25 and 32, thus redrafting claim 32 in independent form. Applicant's amended claims 34 comprises a combination of original claims 25, 33 and 34, thus redrafting claim 34 in independent form. Applicant's amended claims 36 comprises a combination of original claims 25, 35 and 36, thus redrafting claim 36 in independent form. Applicant's amended claims

Application No. 10/716,624

38 comprises a combination of original claims 25, 37 and 38, thus redrafting claim 38 in independent form. In the absence of any art cited against Applicant's original claims 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 36, or 38, it is not believed that any detailed discussion of the cited prior art references is necessary. Suffice to say that all of the claims remaining in this patent application contain subject matter against which no prior art citations have been made.

Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 25, 2005

By:



Bruce H. Troxell
Reg. No. 26,592

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
Telephone: 703 575-2711
Telefax: 703 575-2707